## **Discussion Issues**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Comprehensive Plan Policies and Visions (Package 1, Technical Committee Report, April 8, Exhibit A)		
Differences between the Old     Town zone and the Historic Core     overlay and reasoning for the     recommended approach?     (Miller)	Planning Commission Discussion: Commission Miller asked what are the differences between the Old Town zone and the Historic Core overlay, and what is the reasoning for the Technical Committee's recommended approach?  Staff Response/Recommendation: The vision for the Old Town zone as a whole and for the Historic Core is to be a focus for retail activity as well as other services and housing opportunities. While that portion is similar, the Old Town zone is 30 acres in size and the proposed Historic Core is 11 acres in size. The Historic Core is the location of eight of the City's 16 designated landmark structures. Also, there has been considerable new development during the past few years in the rest of the Old Town zone and very little in the proposed Historic Core. Given this, together with the character of historic structures within the proposed overlay, staff recommends applying the recommended design standards to the Historic Core overlay rather than Old Town zone as a whole. The remaining portions of the Old Town zone will continue to be guided by the policies and code applicable to that zone. When a standard is not addressed specifically for the Historic Core, development within the overlay area would then utilize other applicable code.  Public Comment	Opened 4/20
B. Small Lot Residential Density Limit (Package 1, Technical Committee Report, April 8, 2016, Exhibit B, page 3)		
What could realistically be built on small lots given the remaining standards including on-site parking requirements?	<u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner Biethan asked for additional information regarding what could realistically be constructed if the density maximum was removed and reliance was on other standards including on-site parking, height, bulk, and design?	Opened 4/20

## Old Town Historic Core, Leary Way & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795) - Package 1

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for April 27, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
(Biethan)	Staff Response/Recommendation: Staff will continue analyzing the potential outcomes related to the proposed amendment and follow up regarding this question.  Public Comment:	
C. Exterior Building Material (Package 1, Technical Committee Report, April 8, 2016, Exhibit B)		
1. What is the Design Review Board's process regarding requests for Administrative Design Flexibility such as that proposed for exterior building material? (relates to pgs. 17-18) (Miller)	Planning Commission Discussion: Commissioner Miller requested additional information regarding the process for Design Review Board review of development applications, particularly when requesting the proposed Administrative Design Flexibility regarding exterior building material.  Staff Response/Recommendation: The process for DRB review of design departures within our current process is as follows: if a development proposal does not meet the specific requirements identified in the RZC, staff will prepare an evaluation/analysis of the "departure" through review of applicable codes, policies and design intent statements. This analysis, along with the staff review and recommendation of the overall proposal is prepared for Technical Committee and Design Review Board consideration. In the case of item 5B (Building Material) of the section, the process for DRB review is proposed to be the same as current practice. The DRB is thus provided the decision framework of Comprehensive Plan goals and policies, along with design standards in the RZC. In addition to application of the more prescriptive elements, the current (and proposed) Administrative Design Flexibility provisions within the Zoning Code give additional flexibility to staff and DRB when reviewing design proposals that allow consideration of innovative or "out of the box" proposals.  Public Comment:	Opened 4/20

## Old Town Historic Core, Leary Way & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for April 27, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
Additional Issues		
1. Could portions of Leary Way or Gilman Street be vacated to function as pedestrian-only areas?  (MacNichols, Miller, Nichols)	Planning Commission Discussion: Commissioner MacNichols, Miller, and Nichols requested information regarding the potential for vacation of right of way to take place at locations in the Historic Core such as Leary Way or Gilman Street.  Staff Response/Recommendation: Staff is currently working with a consultant to analyze aspects of the Leary Way and Gilman Street streetscapes and anticipates bringing proposed amendments to the Planning Commission in September 2016. Those recommendations will involve Zoning Code provisions for the street cross-section and applicable standards for adjacent development. Whether portions of these streets should be closed on a permanent or temporary basis to function as pedestrian only is a larger question that would need transportation and other analysis beyond the scope of the proposed Historic Core plan.  Public Comment:	